



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,359	03/09/2000	Wadood Harnad	A-6756	3106
7590	03/23/2004		EXAMINER	
Stewart I Gitler Esq Hoffman Wasson & Gitler PC 2361 Jefferson Davis Highway Suite 522 Arlington, VA 22202			FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/522,359	HAMAD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lawrence D Ferguson	1774

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

- 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 February 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
- 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

- 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
- 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 18 and 19 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 18 and 19.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6 and 8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.


- 8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

- 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

- 10. Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the cited references do not teach the advantages of having a circular or rectangular geometric pattern. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a web impregnated with a polymer in a circular geometrical patterns provided appreciably higher fracture toughness in both MD and CD direction and a web impregnated with polymer in a rectangular geometrical pattern provided a paper or paper board having superior durability in the MD direction and improved fracture toughness in the CD direction) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed Cir. 1993). Applicant argues Terasawa does not teach a paper or board formed from a cellulose fiber network web impregnated with polymer material in geometrical pattern. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Terasawa discloses impregnated paper cellulose made of fiber (abstract and column 2, lines 15-25) having discontinuous circular geometrical formations as shown in Figures 1 and 4 and column 12, lines 51-67, where the paper is impregnated with a polymeric fiber (column 6, line 44 through column 7, line 30).

Continuation of 10. Other: The objection made to claims 5 and 7 is withdrawn due to Applicant cancelling claims 5 and 7. Additionally, there is a minor informality in newly added claim 18. The last word in claim 18, "and" is improper. Examiner suggests deleting this term.



Cynthia M. Relyea
Examiner, Office of Patent Examination
Technology, Office of Technology